# Remarks

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 1, 8, and 14 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. Therefore,

claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

# Objections

Claims 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 14 has been amended to recite a "non-

transitory computer readable medium" per the Examiner's suggestion on page 5 of the Office

Action. (Office Action, 06/04/01, pg. 5.) As such, applicant submits that the present §101

objection to claims 14-18 is overcome and respectfully requests its withdrawal.

# 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-9, 11-12, 14-15 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as

being unpatentable over Riedle (U.S. Patent No. 6,983,334) further in view of Paek (U.S.

Pub. No. 2005/0177625) further in view of Miller1 (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,696) further in

view of Miller2 (U.S. Patent No. 5,920,701) further in view of Srikantan (U.S. Pub. No.

2001/0029548). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Riedle, Paek,

Miller1, Miller2 and Srikantan.

Amended claim 1 recites:

A method comprising:
    executing, by a server device, a multi-threaded application having at
least one thread to monitor a port of the server device for received requests
from a plurality of client devices;
    executing, by the server device, at least three request handlers to
manage any of the received requests from the plurality of client devices,

the at least three request handlers comprising an upload request handler, a multicast download request handler and a unicast download request handler;

detecting, by the server device, that a multicast request is received from a first client device of the plurality of client devices;

invoking, by the server device, the multicast download request handler in order to save session information regarding the received multicast request and create another thread of the multi-threaded application to service the received multicast request;

wherein servicing the received multicast request by the another thread further comprises:

transmitting the plurality of packets of data from the server device to the multiple client devices using a multicast trivial file transfer protocol (TFTP) as a TFTP-compliant flow; and

applying one or more flow control techniques not defined by the multicast TFTP to the TFTP-compliant flow, wherein the flow control techniques comprise determining whether the server device has sufficient resources to satisfy the request based on a block size corresponding to the request and an available bandwidth, and sending an error packet to the first client device if the server device does not have sufficient resources to satisfy the request.

Applicant submits that Riedle, Paek, Miller1, Miller2, and Srikantan does not disclose or suggest <u>invoking, by the server device, the multicast download request handler in order to save session information regarding the received multicast request and create another thread of the multi-threaded application to service the received multicast request</u>, as recited by claim 1. Claims 8 and 14 recite a similar feature as claim 1.

The Office Action acknowledges that "Riedle-Paek-Miller1-Miller2 did not disclose …executing at least three request handlers to manage requests from remote devices, the at least three requests comprising an upload request handler, a multicast download request handler and a unicast download request handler." (Office Action, 06/04/10, pg. 8.) However, the Office Action does cite Srikantan as teaching this feature. The Office Action does further acknowledge, nonetheless, that "[w]hile Srikantan did not explicitly disclose an upload handler, a multicasting handler, and a unicast handler it would have been obvious that

Srikantan recognizes that receiving content, multicasting, and/or unicasting said content as distinct event types (Paragraph 37) and would require separate task objects ('event handlers').

Nevertheless, applicant submits that it would not have been obvious for Srikantan to recognize the existence of separate request handlers of an upload handler, a multicast download handler, and a unicast download handler. Moreover, the above-cited feature of claim 1 further describes the multicast download request handler, namely when stating that the server device invokes the multicast download request handler in order to save session information regarding the received multicast request and create another thread of the multi-threaded application to service the received multicast request. Applicant can find no teaching, disclose, or suggestion of such a multicast download handler in Srikantan that performs the delineated operations now provided by claim 1. As such, Srikantan fails to teach, disclose, or suggest the above-cited feature of claim 1.

Therefore, no combination of Riedle Paek, Miller 1, Miller 2, and Srikantan can teach or suggest the invention as recited in claims 1, 8 and 14. Claims 2, 4, 5 and 7 depend from claim 1. Claims 9, 11 and 12 depend from claim 8. Claims 15 and 17 depend from claim 14. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 15 and 17 are not rendered obvious by Riedle, Paek, Miller 1, Miller 2, and Srikantan for at least the reasons set forth above.


Claims 3, 6, 10, 13, 16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Riedle, further in view of Paek, further in view of Miller1, further in view of Miller2, further in view of Srikantan, further in view of Xu (U.S. Pub. No. 2007/0198737).

Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Riedle, Paek, Miller1, Miller2, Srikantan and Xu. Claims 3, 6, 10, 13, 16 and 18 depend from independent claims discussed above. Xu does not cure the deficiencies of Riedle, Paek, Miller 1, Miller 2, and Srikantan set forth above. Therefore, no combination of Riedle, Paek, Miller 1, Miller 2, Xu, and Srikantan can teach or suggest the invention as recited in claims 3, 6, 10, 13, 16 and 18.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Applicant respectfully petitions for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: __August 17, 2010__        /Ashley Essick/

Ashley R. Essick
Reg. No. 55,515

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(303) 740-1980